DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 539 EA 021 061

AUTHOR Lyons, Geoffrey; And Others
TITLE Employment Relations in Maintained Secondary Schools: Research into Current Problems in Staff Management/Employment Relations and Consequent Training Needs of Headteachers in the Maintained Secondary Sector. Report to the Department of Education and Science.
INSTITUTION National Development Centre for School Management Training, Bristol (England).
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education and Science, London (England).
PUB DATE Jul 86
NOTE 79p.
AVAILABLE FROM Publication Sales, National Development Centre, University of Bristol, School of Education, 35 Berkeley Square, Bristol BS8 1JA, England (5.00 pounds).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Employer Employee Relationship; Foreign Countries; *Personnel Management; Secondary Education; Staff Development; *Supervision; *Supervisory Methods; *Supervisory Training
IDENTIFIERS *England; *Wales

ABSTRACT

This report describes and analyzes the principal findings of a research project into contemporary employment relations in maintained secondary schools in England and Wales. The report identifies problems and issues relating to staff management of current concern to school personnel and to local education authorities (LEAs), and further identifies approaches adopted by a sample of headteachers to the management and employment of staff in their schools, within the framework of policies and procedures established by their LEAs. The following topics emerged as themes central to the study: headteacher management, staff planning, the organization of trade unions and professional associations in the school, maintenance of staff discipline, individual and collective grievances, and headteacher training. The conclusion that headteachers should break away from their traditional authoritarian roles suggests the generation of administrative procedures that enhance shared decision-making. (JAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED346539

EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS IN MAINTAINED SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Research into Current Problems in Staff Management/Employment Relations and Consequent Training Needs of Headteachers in the Maintained Secondary Sector

REPORT TO THE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE

G. LYONS R. STENNING J. MCQUEENEY
North East London Polytechnic, Faculty of Management

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Geoffrey Lyons

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

E4021061

Published on behalf of the authors by the
National Development Centre for School Management Training, 35 Berkeley Square, Bristol, BS8 1JA
Telephone: (0272) 303030 Ext.M.283

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS IN MAINTAINED SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Copyright: G Lyons
R Stenning
J McQueeney

RESEARCH INTO CURRENT PROBLEMS IN STAFF MANAGEMENT/EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS AND CONSEQUENT TRAINING NEEDS OF HEADTEACHERS IN THE MAINTAINED SECONDARY SECTOR

Research Project Team

GEOFFREY LYONS	Joint Research Director
RONALD STENNING	Joint Research Director
JOHN McQUEENEY	Research Fellow
PROF. ALAN BRIMER	Consultant
RONALD WEBSTER	Consultant

Project Secretaries

Mrs E Branch	1981 - 1983
Mrs S Woods	1984 - 1985

CONTENTS

		Page No.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		1
1.0	INTRODUCTION	3
1.1	Industrial Relation Concepts and the Profession of Teaching	3
2.0	THE RESEARCH	5
2.1	Research Objectives and Research Strategies	5
2.2	Selection of LEAs	6
2.3	Selection of Schools for the Main Study	6
2.4	Research Methods	6
2.41	Interviews with the Employers' Associations	7
2.42	LEA Interviews	7
2.43	Headteacher Interviews	7
2.44	In-depth Investigation and Special Studies	8
2.5	Data Collection, Analysis and Presentation	8
3.0	STAFF MANAGEMENT AND THE HEADTEACHER: A CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW	10
3.1	Challenges to Headteachers' Autonomy	11
3.2	Headteachers' Conduct of Staff Management	12
4.0	STAFF PLANNING: SCHOOL STAFFING STRUCTURES APPOINTMENTS AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT	14
4.1	LEA Context	14
4.2	School Staffing Structures	14
4.3	Disclosure of Points Allocation in the School	15
4.4	Staff Appointments: Teaching Staff	16
4.5	Staff Appointments: Non Teaching Staff	16

		Page No.
4.6	Staff Development: LEA Context	17
4.7	Staff Development: The School Context	17
4.8	Staff Appraisal	18
4.9	A Review of Some Main Issues	19
5.0	STAFF COMMUNICATIONS: STRUCTURES AND PROCESSES	21
5.1	Headteacher Practices	21
5.2	A Review of Some Main Issues	22
6.0	ORGANISATION OF TRADE UNIONS AND PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS IN THE SCHOOL	23
6.1	Headteacher Membership of Professional Associations	23
6.2	Local Headteachers' Associations	23
6.3	Teaching Staff	24
6.4	School Based Trade Union Organisation	24
6.5	Recognition of School Based Representative	24
6.6	Union Intervention in School Affairs	25
6.7	Non Teaching Staff	26
6.8	A Review of Some Main Issues	26
7.0	MAINTENANCE OF STAFF DISCIPLINE	28
7.1	LEA Context	28
7.2	The School	28
7.3	Non Teaching Staff	30
7.4	A Review of Some Main Issues	30
8.0	INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE GRIEVANCES	32
8.1	Individual Grievance: The Headteacher's Role	32
8.2	Collective Grievances	32
8.3	Role of the Headteacher	33
8.4	A Review of Some Main Issues	34

			Page No.
9.0	TRAINING HEADTEACHERS FOR STAFF MANAGEMENT: SOME RESIDUAL ISSUES		36
10.0	SUMMARY OF MAIN RESEARCH FINDINGS		37
11.0	RECOMMENDATION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH ARISING FROM THIS RESEARCH PROJECT		40
12.0	APPENDICES		
	APPENDIX 1	Characteristics of LEAs Used in the Main Study	41
	APPENDIX 2	Characteristics of Schools Used in the Main Study	42
	APPENDIX	Research Instruments	
	3A	Headteacher Interview Schedule	46
	3B	Headteacher Interview Schedule	65
Annex	VOLUME 1	Handbook of Staff Management	
	VOLUME 2	Training Materials	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

That a research project of this size and complexity can successfully reach completion is due to the encouragement, help and the goodwill of a large number of individuals and organisations. We would formally like to record here our debt and gratitude to all of them.

We particularly want to express our thanks to the officers of the national representative organisations listed below. Without their assistance this research would not have been possible:

Association of County Councils
Association of Metropolitan Authorities
Assistant Masters and Mistresses Association
Council of Local Education Authorities
General Municipal Boilermakers and Allied Trades Unions
Local Authorities' Conditions of Service Advisory Board
National Association of Headteachers
National Association of Local Government Officers
National Association of Schoolmasters/Union of Women Teachers
National Union of Public Employees
National Union of Teachers
Secondary Heads Association
Society of Education Officers
Transport and General Workers Union

We would also like to thank the members of the project Steering Committee:

Mr E E H Jenkins (Chairman)	1981 - 1983
Prof. R Glatter (Chairman)	1981 - 1984
Mr S Crowne	1983 onwards
DI Mr W T John	1981 - 1983
HMI Miss A C Millett	1983 onwards
Miss G Rickus CBE	
Mr J R K Sayer	
Mr R Shepherd	
Mr F Tye	
Mr L B Webb	1981 - 1983
Mr P White	

They provided us with a great deal of encouragement and specialist advice as well as providing a continuing appraisal of our work and a sounding board for ideas and initiatives. Also a special note of thanks here to Professor Glatter who took over the role of Chairman part way through the project.

We especially want to acknowledge our appreciation to all of the Officers of Local Education Authorities, to the Headteachers, and members of the teaching and non teaching staff of the schools who participated in the project. They willingly gave up their time in the belief that the subject of this research was sufficiently important to the future management of schools: the fact that training programmes for Headteachers and senior

staff was to be a principal outcome to the research reinforced their commitment. Without their participation the help and the information that they so freely and unstintingly gave to us, this research would not have been possible.

We gratefully acknowledge the support provided to us by the Department of Education and Science. The views expressed in this Report are, however, entirely those of the authors. They do not in any way purport to represent the views or the policies of the Department of Education and Science.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This Report provides an account of the conduct, and an analysis in a summary form of the principal findings of a research project into contemporary employment relations in maintained secondary schools in England and Wales.

The Report identifies problems and issues relating to staff management of current concern in schools and LEAs, and further, identifies approaches adopted by a sample of Headteachers to the management and employment of staff in their schools, within the framework of policies and procedures established by their Local Education Authorities. The principal outcome of this project is, however, the production of Training Materials to train Headteachers (and other senior members of staff), in these matters of staff management. Consequently the two major products of the research are:

A Handbook of Staff Management for Headteachers; and
An accompanying volume of inter-related Training Materials.

These are annexed to this Report.

These two volumes of training materials will be published in January 1986 by Hutchinson Education.

The design of the training materials is matched with the current format of inservice provision for Headteachers and senior staff of schools. That is, they are specifically designed to facilitate training based upon a group discussion approach which could also be used by Headteachers in training their own staff.

Fundamental to the research approach adopted is that the generation of training materials applicable to schools' use and acceptable to the profession requires an empirical study of working schools, which clearly identifies the present problems and issues of staff management in the maintained secondary sector.

1.1 Industrial Relations Concepts and the Profession of Teaching

Throughout this Report we use the phrases 'staff management' and 'employment relations' to describe the subject of our research, and we use the terms interchangeably. If this Report were of an investigation into another employment sector then in all probability the language used would refer to 'personnel management' or 'industrial relations'.

However, such was the sensitivity of the field in our initial approaches to both the problems occurring and to their investigation, we felt that such nomenclature was inappropriate.

The project has yielded the first substantial research evidence on staff management in schools in England and Wales. We have become conscious of our consequent responsibility to provide a framework within which the education profession may subsequently perceive and act on matters of staff management.

We have been made aware by reactions during our fieldwork, and initially in setting up the research that what we appear to be doing and advocating runs counter to strongly and deeply held beliefs about teaching as a profession and schools as organisations. Until very recently it would appear that such beliefs, held at all levels of education, provided the principal regulatory mechanism for management staff.

It is not that professional behaviour and standards have been abandoned but are changing in the light of social forces. Certainly, we would not wish to convey the impression that professional values which have underpinned the service have become obsolete. It is simply that effective management practice must acknowledge the continuing shift in professional beliefs and patterns of behaviour.

2.0 THE RESEARCH

The project began in December, 1981 and was initially funded for a six month pilot period. Following a favourable recommendation by the Steering Committee the DES agreed to fund the main phase of the project and this was undertaken between June 1982 and May 1984. An additional recommendation of the Steering Committee agreed that the Project be funded for a further six months until November 1984, and then until March 1985. These latter extensions enabled the continued testing and validation of the handbook of Staff Management for Headteachers, and of the accompanying inter-related volume of training materials.

2.1 Research Objectives and Research Strategies

Our overall research objectives were:

to investigate the patterns of responsibility for staff management at the level of the school, particularly the role of Headteachers;

to investigate the basis of effective, and ineffective staff management practices within the school;

to ascertain the knowledge and skills appropriate to the effective conduct of staff management in schools, and

to produce a comprehensive set of training materials for use by Headteachers in the area of employment relations and staff management.

We have attempted to meet these objectives by addressing attention to:

- the policies and practices of staff management within different LEAS;
- the impact of labour law on the work of Headteachers and its implication for the management of schools;
- the types of staff management problems which commonly confront Headteachers and the coping strategies they adopt;
- the issues upon which teachers' and other unions intervene in schools, and the mode of these interventions; and
- the knowledge and skills which Headteachers (and other involved staff) need and possess.

Our intention has been to identify and examine, by working with selected secondary schools in a small number of LEAs, aspects of staff management which, we believe, are indicative and illustrative of the range of issues occurring nationally. A nationally representative sample of schools would have been premature and unnecessary. In fact, the uncertainty in the field at the outset of this study, in the absence of any other research of substance made this the only practicable approach. *

---

* Since starting the project a research report has been published. Walsh, Dunne, Stewart, Stoten (1982). The Management of Teachers: Problems of Contraction. Institute of Local Government Studies. University of Birmingham. Although the focus of this research concerned LEAs, our findings in fact prove complementary.

2.2 Selection of LEAs

The research strategy was to identify and secure the participation of a small number of LEAs typifying authorities in England and Wales and that the sample would provide an indication of the current range and variety of approaches to employment relations, policies and practice in LEAs at large.

The characteristics of the six LEAs included in the main sample are to be found at Appendix 1.

2.3 Selection of Schools for the Main Study

In each LEA either six or eight schools were selected to represent, firstly, the types of schools found within that LEA and secondly, the differing approaches to staff management found there.

The number of schools included in the study was restricted to 40 since this number adequately represented the variables we wished to cover. Schools were initially identified by the LEA according to criteria dictated by the research design although the final decision to include the school in the sample rested with the research team. The criteria related to stratification by size of schools (as determined by the number of pupils); type of school (voluntary aided and county schools); 'origin' of the school (whether it was originally a grammar, secondary modern, comprehensive, etc.); schools which developed 'naturally' or were brought into being by amalgamations; stability of enrolment (whether pupil rolls were stable, contracting or expanding); and schools representing different catchment areas. Additionally we asked that LEAs ensured the sample included both male and female Headteachers, Headteachers with differing lengths of experience, and, if possible, some who had been Headteachers of more than one secondary comprehensive school.

The sample of schools is set out in Appendix 2.

2.4 Research Methods

Four main approaches were adopted. Firstly, informal discussion with officers representing the employers, trade unions and professional associations at national level were initiated. These contacts were a crucial element in the preparation of the study, and indeed were maintained throughout to help monitor developments at national level and also to ensure continuing commitment to the project.

Secondly, structured interviews with LEA officers and, where appropriate, the area or regional representatives of the trade unions and professional associations were undertaken. These initial contacts were seen as a means of gaining support and commitment to the project at LEA level, but in subsequent interviews were an important source for the collection of data.

Thirdly, structured interviews with Headteachers took place. These were based upon a Headteachers' Interview Schedule (see Appendix 3). This was developed on the one hand to encompass the broad range of issues with staff management implications, whilst allowing the identification of activities which might repay further investigation.

Fourthly, in these latter cases, subsequent visits were made to schools for in-depth investigation of selected topics.

Further information was obtained throughout the project by monitoring the specialist and professional educational journals to keep abreast of developments at national and local level.

These four approaches are expanded in more detail in sections 2.41 to 2.44 below.

2.41 Interviews with the Employers' Associations

Apart from providing a wider context in which to understand current employment relations policies and problems we obtained copies of those model instruments and agreements which are nationally provided to their members. Of particular importance are those which have become widely known by the colour of their cover. The Burgundy Book and the Purple Book are examples.

2.42 LEA Interviews

We met with those officers of the LEA who had particular responsibilities for staff management matters in schools. The intention was to set the context for our subsequent interviews with the sample of secondary Headteachers and to provide a framework in which Headteachers' approaches to staff management/employment relations in their schools could be analysed.

To this end we wished to establish an overall impression of the development of the Authorities' policies in secondary (and tertiary) education; to look at procedures for manpower planning and the allocation of staff to schools; to trace the development of employment relations and obtain an indication of the scope of collective bargaining and extent of procedural provision; to gain an indication of the overall employment relations strategies and bargaining styles; and finally, to follow through critical incidents which arose in the context of a school but which were only resolved by the use of the external grievances, disputes or the disciplinary procedure.

2.43 Headteacher Interviews

The Headteacher interviews were the critical source of data in relation to our research objectives and served a number of purposes. They provided a means to identify the range of employment relations issues and problems which are presently of concern to Headteachers; they provided an alternative perspective on the LEAs' (and to a

lesser extent, trade unions') strategies, policies and practice; they gave an opportunity to identify a range of leadership styles and coping strategies adopted by Headteachers, and the different ways in which schools are structured and managed. They also gave an opportunity to identify incidents and issues that would repay more detailed investigation.

Interviews with Headteachers lasted for a minimum of two and a half hours and were conducted in a conversational style via an interview schedule constructed in checklist form. Two interviewers conducted each interview and each separately wrote up the fieldnotes for subsequent agreement on their accuracy.

2.44 In-Depth Investigation and Special Studies

Various items were identified in the course of Headteachers' interviews which invited investigation in depth. Consequently studies were conducted:

of the management of non teaching staff;

of a school recently formed from the merger of two schools focussing on the criteria used in the allocation of middle and senior management positions, and internal organisational structure;

of the development of pilot schemes for staff appraisal;

of the process of communication and consultation in one school in which most of the teaching and non teaching staff were interviewed.

A separate study was conducted of a major strike by one of the teachers' professional associations, as it affected 11 secondary schools and their Headteachers in one LEA.

2.5 Data Collection, Analysis and Presentation

Our intention was not to make a detailed case study of each encounter but to gain illustrative insight and sympathetic understanding of those problems of staff management currently giving concern to Headteachers. Two factors conditioned our collection and treatment of data. The first, already confirmed by the pilot project, was that, in organising the collection and analysis of data, the usefulness and relevance of 'industrial relations' analytical frameworks, had much to offer us.

The second, was that, when analysed, the data should contribute to Headteachers' understanding and perception of staff management issues and should be usable by them in their analysis and diagnosis of staff management matters within the school.

Thus both the structure of the material and the language in which it was expressed had to be recognisable by Headteachers as relevant and helpful to their present condition, and assist in the construction of training materials.

One further factor was ever present throughout the project: the sensitivity of involved staff to those areas we wished to explore and report on. The necessity of gaining and retaining the confidence and the commitment of those we were to work with was critical in data collection, and in the quality of the data we were likely to obtain.

Conventional survey research approaches, employing self-report questionnaires were clearly not viable. A number of in-depth interviews guided by a structured schedule, and the gathering of as much confirmatory, supplementary and contextual data as could be realistically assembled and analysed, was the practical way forward.

Data was analysed according to key concepts conventionally adopted in standard industrial relations approaches to data analysis and presentation, though restated in a form more likely to find acceptability in the education profession.

Information from a number of other sources also helped formulate our own policy on data presentation. These sources included earlier reports to the Steering Committee and subsequent discussion with the Committee members; early drafts of training materials and trials of those drafts in the field; comments of 'expert' readers whose opinions were sought on certain matters. All of these sources of information began to dictate the shape in which we might most expeditiously present our findings.

It also became evident from the need for structure and for support expressed by those we interviewed, that discussion provoking training materials would, by themselves, be insufficient. Accordingly the concept of a Handbook allied to a complementary and inter-related set of training materials and organised into sections as shown in Annex 1 was put forward.

3.0 STAFF MANAGEMENT AND THE HEADTEACHER: A CONTEXT AND OVERVIEW

In the last few years a substantial change has taken place in the staff management activities that Headteachers are called on to deal with. This applies to the incidence of such activities, the range of issues they represent, and applies to the involvement of both teaching and non teaching members of staff of a school. Previously the characteristic feature of employment relations in schools was the high degree of mutual accommodation and trust, a relationship presently proving more and more difficult to sustain. In turn the nature of professional roles and the practice of professional relationships and behaviours become closely scrutinised and re-appraised, and this scrutiny and re-appraisal applies equally to the role and functions of the Headteacher, as it does to the activities of the staff in their schools.

Let us briefly identify some of the more important issues which provide background and context to the Headteachers' actions. These issues, whilst in themselves having wider implications than the particular practical focus of staff management, may well prove a considerable constraint on the Headteachers' freedom to manage the school effectively and efficiently.

Schools are increasingly subject to social and economic pressures, and whilst they are not unique in this respect, their previous insulation from such pressures make them more vulnerable. Financial cutbacks; rumours of redundancy or re-deployment; staff grievances; discipline problems; disputes of rights and disputes of interest occurring more frequently; union action becoming more sophisticated and militant; low staff morale associated with reduced opportunity for promotion; the impact of labour law ... all in some way or other daily confront the Headteacher and threaten the effective operation of the school.

Most of the Headteachers interviewed reported that the balance of their daily tasks had changed. Matters of internal organisation were less dominant whilst involvement with the LEA, the Board of Governors, parents, trade union representatives and other outside groups featured more strongly. Those Headteachers most recently appointed drew attention to their ill-preparedness for these more overtly 'political' and 'public relations' aspects of the Headteachers' role which as Deputies they had not fully appreciated.

Previously the Headteacher was perceived as functionally autonomous in the regulation of school affairs. This position has increasingly become attenuated by regulations and policies developed by the LEA, and by greater demands for information and accountability from parents, Governors and members of the school's teaching staff. Although there are differences in the degree of LEA regulation of schools, policy documents, procedures, and operational guidelines, expressions of concern about the apparent trend towards greater intervention in the life of the school were consistently made.

The distribution of responsibility for employment relations in schools is often complex and sometimes obscure. So long as staff could be regulated by convention this did not matter; when they could not, the Headteacher who was politically adroit would survive but others were disoriented outside the traditional ambit of professional judgement. The inability of Headteachers to discern the appropriate adjustment and responses to change in employment relations stems in part from the absence of clear lines of communication between LEAs and schools, a lack of articulated policies, and the existence of overlapping spheres of responsibility.

3.1 Challenges to Headteachers' Autonomy

Evidence of the erosion of the Headteachers' traditional freedoms of action, of the conflicts of interest they experience, and of the challenges to their authority, were reported in many forms and are recognisable in the following:

- they were squeezed between Unions and the LEA;
- they reported a lack of, on the one hand 'carrots', and on the other hand officially recognised sanctions to apply to staff;
- they were often members of a union in dispute with the employer;
- they reported mediating between groups of non teaching staff who were 'in dispute' without having had responsibility assigned to them;
- multi reporting systems were found to occur concerning non teaching staff, eg the caretaker who reports to the Headteacher, Supervisor of Caretakers and Area Office;
- there was in the school, regarding staff management matters, little devolution of responsibility and little apparent inclination of senior staff to adopt a strong staff management role;
- action often drifted towards the Headteacher whose advisory recommendations to the LEA need not be upheld;
- the Headteacher has only limited scope to change the organisational structure of the school since he/she is increasingly constrained by points availability and by re-deployment, 'redundancy', 'ring fence' and other recruitment agreements negotiated between LEAs and Unions;
- short term, local, financial and political perspectives intruded more frequently and directly into the everyday management of the school, in conflict with the essential needs predicted upon a five-year cycle of a cohort of pupils.

3.2 Headteachers' Conduct of Staff Management

The period over which staff management issues have become prominent is short. The rapid change exposed many to a realisation of their lack of the necessary skill and knowledge, and their lack of sympathy with the culture in which such matters arise. Similar lack of skill and knowledge was evident amongst LEA Education Officers and Advisers/Inspectors. Attempts to remedy the situation are now being sought in appointments in some LEAs of personnel specialists, though such specialists are added in an advisory capacity without fundamental change in the structure of staff management responsibilities.

Whilst a significant minority of Headteachers had created problems for the LEA and indeed themselves as a consequence of failing to act in accordance with employment law and/or LEA practice, a few adroit Headteachers had built up their own sources of information on which they could decide to act. Where the occasion demanded, this would by-pass existing authority structures and further erode the status of the traditional helping agencies.

Only a very few Headteachers appeared to understand fully the contemporary employment relations climate of the education service and through anticipatory policies adopt appropriate strategies to cope with the wide variety of external and internal pressures confronting the school. These Headteachers were well versed in LEA policies and procedures; knew precisely where they could obtain information from within the LEA; and were not averse to exerting pressure on local politicians, via their Chairman of School Governors or by indirect use of the local news media.

According to their own accounts the coping Headteachers in staff management matters displayed a high level of interpersonal skill, were flexible in response to unexpected events, did not commit themselves too early to a personal position, adopted a long term strategy and appropriate administrative procedures, and had re-thought a personal philosophy.

Few headteachers displayed all of these qualities. However, the Headteacher who accepted a responsibility for helping staff understand the issues and problems raised by changed circumstances appeared to have fewer problems in managing staff.

In concluding this section we draw attention to one further but over-riding complicating feature which we have encountered in so many different ways, both by hearsay and by direct observations; also it would seem to pervade many levels of the management of educational institutions. That is, whilst some Headteachers in seeking to regulate staff behaviour appealed to professional norms, according to which the leader is projected as a first amongst equals in a college of peers, actual leadership displayed on so many occasions appeared to be strongly authoritarian and autocratic.

The weakness of any authoritarian position when challenged lies in the lack of cogency of the principles used to justify the exercise of authority. When professional norms were conventionally accepted the reasonableness of authority was not challenged, but once such norms were subject to 'clarification' or 're-interpretation', the authority appeared unreasonable and action in accordance with these norms was regarded as autocratic.

There appears to be widespread recognition within the service that a new professional consensus must be forged between Headteachers and staff. However, our study suggests that only a small minority of Headteachers are initiating debates within their schools aimed at developing mutual understanding and fostering a sense of common purpose among the adult community of the school. In the absence of such discussions it would seem that the authority and credibility of the Headteacher will become increasingly difficult to sustain.

4.0 STAFF PLANNING: SCHOOL STAFFING STRUCTURES: APPOINTMENTS AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT

4.1 LEA Context

The study at LEA level suggests that while LEAs are beginning to develop systematic policies and plans for staff planning and staff management, in most cases this is a recent response to the imminent issue of contraction. While this study has not delved deeply into the 'manpower' information resources available within LEAs, the study indicates that such information resources as do exist apparently were not in every LEA being drawn together systematically to produce a strategic overview. The development of such information would seem to be a pre-requisite for the development of forecasts and plans which could be applied at school level.

Only in one LEA did we find a relatively sophisticated manpower planning exercise involving the Headteachers in schools. Here, rolling forecasts over a three year period regarding projected pupil rolls, staffing levels and other resources, were developed for each school in the LEA. Following the publication to schools of this information, the LEA's senior officers annually initiated consultations with Headteachers on an individual school basis. This was to discuss how the school would try to adapt and develop organisationally to provide a curriculum within the manpower projections provided. Discussion regarding allocations for the subsequent year would always begin by a review of the previous year's performance and of the appropriateness of the allocations. This planning and consultative mechanism was commented upon favourably by the majority of the Headteachers interviewed in the LEA concerned. It directed them and their staff to re-appraise their curriculum, to resolve difficulties and critical issues regarding the allocation of posts especially in the context of restructuring and voluntary redeployment, and to use the school's consultative procedures to do this.

4.2 School Staffing Structures

The study also indicated that in general terms LEAs did not have policies, provide models or guidelines or set outline criteria to aid Headteachers in designing staffing structures appropriate to the present and future needs of the school. With the onset of contraction and the promulgation of LEA stances on curriculum provision, the Headteacher's freedom to determine the internal organisation structure of the school is increasingly constrained. In the majority of schools visited the Headteacher's freedom of manoeuvre had been reduced, though the degree of flexibility retained still varied according to individual circumstances.

While LEA curriculum policies imposed constraints upon how Headteachers approach staffing in the school the principal inhibition was the Burnham unit total system which determines the points allocation. Here, the study indicated that while some LEAs allocate

points in fairly strict accordance with the Burnham model (though vary to the extent they allocate at the lower, middle or upper range) in others there are local additions which take into account such things as social priority indicators, protection of the curriculum, etc.

From the position of the Headteacher in the school the global allocation of points represents the major constraint upon Headteacher's freedom of manoeuvre. The critical issue does not seem to be related to overall points allocation per se but rather upon whether the LEA has a stated policy or not, and how the numbers of points are disclosed and disseminated. On this question we can broadly divide the LEAs in this study into two groups.

First, LEA's which have a stated policy on allocation of points to schools which is generally known and made available to all Headteachers within the LEA. The approach of these LEAs varies as to how the information is disclosed, eg whether it is through normal consultative procedures; through the negotiating machinery; direct to Headteachers as a group or on an individual basis.

Second, there are LEAs which do not have explicit, generally known policies and where Headteachers are informed on an individual basis. In these LEAs it can be difficult to establish whether or not there is a single set or multiple criteria applied or whether each school's establishment is settled on an ad hoc basis.

Generally, the allocation and notification of points took place on a year by year basis, with the one exception noted above, where the LEA provided each school with a three year projection annually. In these instances a more systematic and greater provision of information would provide opportunities for Headteachers to engage in systematic manpower planning; to consult with staff about curriculum and organisational restructuring; and to discuss with them the implications for the organisation, allocation and distribution of work.

4.3 Disclosure of Points Allocation in the School

Our sample of Headteachers were divided on the question of whether Burnham points allocation should be disclosed generally to staff and specifically to union representatives.

A range of practice was found: some do not systematically provide information but would if it was requested by senior staff or teacher representative; others would disclose information in confidence providing it was not generally made available; some were reluctant under present circumstances, e.g. because of a possible need to retrench in the next year; whilst others more forthrightly expressed the view that this was not a concern of teaching staff. More rarely did the Headteachers in our sample provide such information as part of the general consultative process.

4.4 Staff Appointments: Teaching Staff

LEA policies applying to the processes of recruiting and appointing staff tended to follow a general pattern. LEA representatives were ostensibly directly involved in drawing up short lists of candidates, interviewing and appointing; their degree of intervention increasing with the seniority of posts.

In the main, extant policies were reflected in practices adopted. Here, a small minority of the Headteachers indicated that by negotiation or default they had acquired considerable freedom from the LEA when it came to interviewing and making selection decisions up to deputy headship. While not being afforded the same degree of confidence by the LEA, the majority of Headteachers used various strategems to ensure that their preferred candidate was appointed.

In one LEA all teaching appointments were made by a sub-committee of the Education Committee, with the Headteacher and Adviser in attendance. In this particular instance the Headteacher and Adviser drew up the specification for the post and were responsible for the main sift of candidates. Appointments made by the sub-committee were, on occasions, against the advice of the Headteacher and Adviser.

Almost without exception the Headteachers in our sample believed that the quality of candidates had risen significantly over the past few years. This did not, however, apply to some specialist areas such as Maths and Crafts where they continued to experience difficulty in appointing teachers.

Some Headteachers expressed a strong preference for recruiting generalist teachers because this gave more flexibility in organising the school and its curriculum, although the contra opinion existed, that is the need to continue recruiting specialist teachers in the belief that this was necessary to protect and develop academic standards. The majority of Headteachers, however, thought that both were necessary and it was a question of getting the balance right. In some instances the Headteachers had little option but to accept redeployed teachers.

Notwithstanding the way(s) in which the LEAs allocated points to the school, in circumstances of falling or static school rolls and local redeployment agreements, the Headteacher's scope for appointing staff is effectively reduced. Most of the Headteachers interviewed said that the senior management team prepared job descriptions in consultation with the heads of department concerned. It seems that very few heads of department served on interviewing panels, though they usually met the candidates while they were being shown round the school. We could find little evidence of Headteachers or the LEA producing effective 'personnel specifications'.

4.5 Staff Appointments: Non Teaching Staff

The procedures for recruiting school support staff varied between LEAs but it appears that Headteachers are only minimally involved. This applies particularly to caretakers, canteen supervisors and ground staff where we found many instances of Headteachers taking no part in their selection.

Some Headteachers expressed concern at their exclusion and gave examples of unfortunate appointments where the new recruit had a disruptive impact on staff relationships which necessitated the mediation of the Headteacher.

4.6 Staff Development: LEA Context

Staff development for both teaching and non teaching staff can only realistically take place within a framework of policies and procedures set by the LEA, largely, but not solely, because of the resource implications. However, it seems that such policies have not previously been systematically developed, or applied, by LEAs although there is now some indication that they are beginning to emerge. Whilst professional and management development training opportunities for school staff were provided by all the LEAs, the scope of the provision varied considerably, and apart from the training activities exclusively reserved for Headteachers, deputies and specialist teachers, access for school staff tended to be on a 'first come first served' basis. A systematic identification of individual and institutional need relating to future staffing requirements within the context of the LEA's policies for its schools had rarely occurred. There is evidence that this situation is now beginning to change.

4.7 Staff Development: The School Context

With a very few notable exceptions, the schools participating in this study did not have written staff development policies though all the Headteachers indicated that they were firmly committed to the development of their staff.

In most of the schools a deputy head was given responsibility for staff development. A common feature was for the deputies to circulate literature about external courses to heads of department and/or to the staffroom. Staff who wished to attend courses would seek the support of senior colleagues and the Headteacher and, where support was forthcoming, the necessary arrangements were made with the LEA. In many cases current union policies entail the Headteacher confirming with the LEA that cover for staff will be available before such permission is given.

Within most schools, staff development opportunities tended to be perceived firstly, as enabling staff to attend externally provided courses of in-service training, and secondly, to offer opportunity for development within the normal work of the school. For example, staff may be invited to serve on committees and to undertake particular projects or courses of action which were almost invariably instigated by the Headteacher. It does not follow that staff involved perceived this as a training device.

We found very few schools where members of staff were provided with opportunities (apart from serving on committees) to gain wider experience than their existing roles permitted.

Some rare exceptions were found of job rotation and also of mentoring, ie where a more junior member of staff would work alongside a more senior or experienced colleague to gain insight and experience of the more senior post. This would be undertaken without financial advantage to the members of staff concerned.

In the present climate where the opportunity of moving post through promotion is so restricted, an effective device available to schools for development and training is likely to be job rotation or mentoring. Perceived as an opportunity for job enrichment, or of adding to an individual member of staff's breadth of experience, such courses of action have much to offer. However, the dangers in such mechanisms becoming the exclusive or dominant mode for development and training of staff are self-evident.

It also appeared to be correspondingly rare for staff development to be the domain of the department and a principle responsibility of the head of department. In fact almost without exception the Headteachers consistently expressed concern about the effectiveness of at least some of their heads of departments, some of whom they had inherited and others they had been instrumental in appointing.

Apart from the first deputy head occasionally deputising for the Headteacher, we did not find instances where the deputy heads exchanged their assigned roles except in the case of absence. The deputies tended to have highly specific duties such as pastoral affairs, or timetabling, although, in practice, there was invariably a degree of overlap.

In the main, the Headteachers strongly supported this practice, chiefly on the grounds that rotating roles and responsibilities among staff would have a disruptive impact on the school. They further suggested that the Burnham points system effectively prevented them from assigning members of staff to undertake work normally done by their more senior colleagues. Institutional led staff development appeared to be very rare amongst our sample of schools.

4.8 Staff Appraisal

Staff appraisal, the key-stone of staff development and promotion policies, was almost wholly absent in the sample of schools.

Staff appraisal linked to the development and growth of both school and individual, and which is effected through departmental structures seems rare. We had largely to go outside our sample of schools to provide examples for use in constructing training materials.

Few schools appeared to regularly assess the head of department against departmental performance in the context of agreed departmental and school policies. A similar state of affairs appears to prevail for deputy heads and other senior members of staff.

Whilst responsibility for the effectiveness of the performance of the teacher in the classroom titularly rests with the head of department, because of timetable commitments, the ambivalence of responsibilities and possibly a professional unwillingness to admit of such responsibilities, this rarely seems to occur. If problems should arise concerning staff then, rather than the head of department being instrumental in dealing with them, it seems as if they are invariably passed to a deputy or to the Headteacher.

It is unclear whether the LEA (or Local Authority) exercises appraisal policies for non teaching members of staff located in schools.

4.9 A Review of Some Main Issues

The research findings would largely confirm the view that staff appraisal linked to institution-led succession planning and staff development was almost wholly absent in our sample of schools.

The research findings would also suggest that the Headteacher's influence in the processes of recruitment and selection of all categories of school staff is becoming increasingly circumscribed by protectionist policies and local collective agreements devised to minimise the full repercussions of contraction, especially redeployment and redundancy. Particularly important in this context are: the establishment of a pool of teachers surplus to current requirements; limiting the competition for posts via 'ring fence' agreements; and, the use of fixed term contracts. A further factor prompting the LEAs in our sample to intervene in the recruitment and selection of staff, has been employment legislation, particularly provision against race and sex discrimination.

By accident rather than design it seems, LEAs have constructed the beginnings of a framework of manpower and succession policies for their school based employees. Moreover, where schools unofficially attempt to limit external recruitment to Scale 1 posts, making subsequent promoted posts available by competition amongst existing staff within the school, (in so far as this proves possible and practical) then the elements of manpower policies, succession planning and institutional led staff development become even more pronounced.

Since staffing levels are determined externally, and morale of staff is generally low, schools are finding it extremely difficult to generate a capacity for renewal. The vast majority of the Headteachers interviewed said that creativity and innovation were crucial for the future vitality (in some cases, survival) of the school, but in the present circumstances this was difficult, if not impossible, to achieve.

Headteachers felt they had few incentives to offer and indeed no effective sanctions they could impose on reluctant teachers hence one of the few real strategies at the Headteacher's disposal is

persuasion. Whilst in our study the opportunity for staff mobility and internal promotion had been drastically reduced for the majority of schools, we found little 'hard' evidence of Headteachers having reviewed their staff development practices.

The research suggests that succession planning is largely non existent in school. However, for the future health and vitality of schools, teachers aspiring to advance their careers via head of department posts to Headships ought to have acquired, in a planned way, some knowledge and experience of the roles they may subsequently undertake prior to their appointment to a promoted post.

In our sample it appears that the opportunity for individuals to develop themselves, especially with regard to the acquisition of administrative and management experience, is, in many cases, extremely limited.

A case in point is the practice of assigning deputy heads to specific, often very narrowly conceived roles that give little insight into the variety of tasks performed by the Headteacher.

Most of the newly appointed Headteachers participating in this research echoed the view of one of their colleagues who felt "he had been thrown into the deep end and it was largely a case of sink or swim". A very small minority of these Headteachers had been 'groomed' for Headship by their previous Headteacher(s).

Succession planning worthy of the description cannot take place in the absence of performance assessment or staff appraisal conducted in the light of the aims and objectives set for the school. Staff development programmes identified from institutional or individual diagnosis appear to be the exception rather than the rule.

In our Main Study we found no evidence of a systematic application of staff assessment. At the direction of the Steering Committee, research was undertaken in two schools located in LEAs outside the main sample, which were developing systems of staff appraisal.

5.0 STAFF COMMUNICATIONS: STRUCTURES AND PROCESSES

5.1 Headteacher Practices

The Headteachers' approaches to communication and consultation with staff reflected their orientation to the organisation and structuring of the schools, and their management styles and postures.

The research confirms that the formal structures for communicating with staff, e.g. Staff Association, were common to almost all of the schools visited. But the way(s) in which they were used varied considerably between schools according to the preferences chiefly, but by no means solely, of the Headteacher.

Another common feature of the schools was that insufficient attention was addressed to the purposes of the communication and as a consequence, inappropriate mechanisms were frequently used in an endeavour to communicate with staff.

The findings suggest that the majority of the Headteachers did not clearly distinguish between the related, but analytically distinct, processes of communication and consultation in relation to staff: the latter being essentially about shared decision making, and the former about information on aims, objectives, policies and procedures.

Headteachers' approaches to consultation fall broadly into three types: the first, the Headteacher alone, or a selected group of staff, formulate and discuss policy, and there is no deliberate attempt to structure consultation. In the second, responsibility for consultation is delegated formally to middle management level, where heads of department, year heads, etc. are 'expected' or 'required' to consult and respect the views of staff for whom they are directly responsible. In the third, there is a formal consultative structure centering on direct representational mechanisms to involve staff in areas of policy formulation and implementation.

Our findings suggest that the most common pattern is the second - 'consultation through delegation' - of which there are a number of variants. A problem common to all was ensuring that consultation with staff did in fact take place. Although identifying middle management as the weak link in the process, few Headteachers expressed willingness to establish and maintain common standards relating to the holding of meetings; minutes; written departmental policies, objectives and so forth.
The third pattern - 'direct representation' - via project and standing committees, was also fairly common. Here, the research suggests that Headteachers strongly influenced the outcomes by identifying the issues; determining the terms of reference of the committees and working parties; and, in some cases, supervising their work.

The evidence also indicated that there was a tendency for membership of such groups to be drawn from a relatively small number of the total staff, and we found very few instances where non teaching staff were represented. We cannot say with any confidence whether the relatively exclusive membership of the committees was a reflection of the Headteachers' policies, or because of apathy.

The Headteachers commonly regarded a description of the academic and pastoral structure as sufficient to explain the school's internal decision making processes. However, such outlines do not help staff (particularly those newly appointed) to understand how the school operates in practice, and to identify where they, and others, fit into the decision making scheme.

Few schools have, as yet, clearly defined management policies, with operating guidelines, reflecting, perhaps, the reluctance of significant numbers of the Headteachers to put on paper for staff their educational philosophies and objectives. The majority, however, had developed written guidelines covering administrative procedures and routines, though there was considerable variation in their range and availability. Most were not collated into a single, comprehensive document such as a school Staff Handbook. Where these existed, very few had sections explicitly devoted to policy statements or of practice concerning internal decision making processes, or arrangements for communication and consultation with staff. It may be inferred, therefore, that junior staff particularly may be unsure as to their own role in these processes, and how they may influence them.

5.2 A Review of Some Main Issues

In practice, the 'delegated' and 'representative' mechanisms are not mutually exclusive. However, if 'representative' approaches are to develop, especially but not wholly in response to younger teachers' expectations, they will need firm policy underpinnings; and Headteachers will have to ensure that the meaning given to 'consultation' and its relationship to decision making processes, is clear to their staff. Indeed, the introduction of a consultative system should, logically, itself involve a consultative exercise!

The attitude of the Headteacher emerges as a key determinant of whether effective communication and consultation with staff takes place within the school. However, while clear and specified policies, objectives and procedures may emerge from and underpin a more 'open' and participative style of staff management, in which there is a commitment to communication and consultation with staff, they cannot in themselves guarantee it.

Where formal responsibility is assigned to middle management, but there is little or no accountability at these levels, then the system may fall into disrepute. There may indeed be some danger that under external and internal pressures to improve communication and engender participation, the outward and bureaucratised forms of participative structures may be mistaken for the essence.

6.0 ORGANISATION OF TRADE UNIONS AND PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS IN THE SCHOOL

6.1 Headteacher Membership of Professional Associations

The most common pattern to emerge in this study was for Headteachers to be members of organisations that were exclusively representative of them. Since one of these Associations has 'opened up' membership to deputy heads such exclusivity is unlikely to be a feature in future. Moreover, there were a significant number of the Headteachers who claimed dual membership with one of the major teachers' unions.

The predominant reasons given for membership of associations were chiefly legal protection and advice concerning the operation of the school. A small number of the Headteachers held membership of the union with the largest representation on the school, ostensibly so as not to distance themselves from the staff. However, membership is also of strategic value because it gives them entry to union Branch meetings and immediate access to union policies and decisions, apart from giving the Headteacher the opportunity to influence the course of local events.

In the sphere of employment relations, the Headteachers confirmed that they sought the assistance of their associations in cases of staff indiscipline and on occasions of disputes between teachers (or support staff) and employers. While it would be misleading to say that the Headteachers did not see the LEA as a resource in such circumstances, they almost invariably checked the status of the advice given by the LEA with their association either at national or local level.

6.2 Local Headteachers' Associations

Although all the national associations representing Headteachers, whether as an exclusive cadre or part of the general community of teachers, have their own network of branches, there is evidence to suggest that membership of the local Headteachers' Associations is valued by Headteachers and indeed, LEAs.

This is primarily because such associations transcend sectional differences promoted and reinforced by the national associations, and facilitate collective representation to the LEAs on matters of common concern to Headteachers. Most of the Headteachers in our study also saw the local Headteachers' Association as a valuable agency for sharing experiences and expertise, especially in circumstances of collective disputes. From the standpoint of the LEA, these forums provide a useful sounding board vis potentially contentious issues, and reduce the necessity of dealing with a multiplicity of unions representing Headteachers.

6.3 Teaching Staff

The pattern of school based trade union membership in this study generally reflects the national pattern. Within individual schools, however, the general pattern was for one of the two largest teachers' unions to represent the majority of the staff and for their colleagues to be distributed among the other associations.

The critical factors here were the character and experience of the representative of the dominant union in the school, and the attitude of the Headteacher towards unionism in general and staff union representatives in particular (see below).

Apart from crisis situations there was little evidence in our study of intense competition and rivalry between the representatives and members of the respective unions. Where disputes with employers had arisen there were some changes in union affiliation - both to and from the more pro-active associations in that particular situation. Further, in such circumstances it was not uncommon for inter-union differences to surface, but in the main they were not so deep-rooted as to cause lasting divisions among staff in the school once the instances were identified.

6.4 School Based Trade Union Organisation

In nearly all of the schools in our study staff representatives existed for the teachers' unions. For the most part they perceived their role to be the recruitment of members and the circulation of union publications. Additionally, some of them pursued their members' grievances with the Headteachers and/or LEA. A very small minority represented their members in disciplinary proceedings though in most cases their intervention was via their role as District Secretary of the union.

6.5 Recognition of School Based Representatives

The extent and scope of recognition given to school based representatives depends largely on the arrangements and agreements made at LEA level, and representatives' relationships with their colleagues, especially the Headteacher.

In all but two of the LEAs in this study the criteria and standards set in the Burgundy Book were taken as given. Two LEAs, however, had negotiated supplementary agreements which in some areas (e.g. time off to attend trade union courses, and carrying out trade union duties) went beyond the provisions agreed nationally, in terms of detail. However, as indicated above, the scope and depth of recognition given to school based representatives depends very much on relationships within the school.

In the majority of schools visited the pattern of meetings between Headteacher and staff union representatives was casual though meetings were sometimes convened on an ad hoc basis, usually in the light of collective action. In general, Headteachers did not provide information to trade union representatives that they did not make available to other members of staff.

There was, however, a small number of Headteachers in our example who were pro-active in initiating regular meetings with staff union representatives to discuss such matters as teacher redeployment and, less commonly, the distribution of Burnham points. These Headteachers, whilst not necessarily supporting the aims of the national unions, generally displayed a heightened sense of awareness about the changing nature of schools and the education service generally.

Their stance towards staff union representatives contrasts sharply with a significant minority of Headteachers who refuse to acknowledge the presence of union representatives in the school. These headteachers seem attitudinally bound by traditional values and notions of professionalism, and to them recognition of union representatives was tantamount to a betrayal of the principles which they had long abided by. Where staff perceived this response as genuine, their reaction was generally one of respect; and the staff union representative maintained a low profile in the schools. In contrast, where staff doubted the sincerity of the Headteacher's stance towards unions there was evidence of considerable union agitation within the schools.

We were unable to confirm in any single instance whether staff responses were a direct consequence of the Headteacher's attitude towards the union representative, or was a product of other factors, such as previous experience of trade union action, or commitment to trade unionism per se.

6.6 Union Intervention in School Affairs

Staff union representatives' intervention in the life of the school tends to be prompted (with some notable exceptions) by national or local union policy initiatives rather than personal ambition or differences with the Headteacher. The evidence from our study suggests that union intervention in the conduct of the school is growing as a consequence of union policy decisions and the withdrawal of staff goodwill.

Union intervention is particularly manifest in sanctions such as refusal to cover for absent colleagues and/or to carry out supervisory duties at lunch time. Such activities are familiar and Headteachers have endeavoured (with varying degrees of success) to cope with them for some time.

In many ways the withdrawal of staff goodwill is a more intractable problem, if only because it emerges in all sorts of ways, often to the complete surprise of the Headteacher. We found many instances of staff suddenly departing from customary practice and refusing to attend staff meetings outside of school hours, parents' evenings, and a host of similar extra curricula duties which staff had previously undertaken.

6.7 Non Teaching Staff

As with teachers, in our study there is a high density of union membership among school support staff. The pattern of membership tends to follow the occupational categories - caretaking, clerical staff and so forth.

In the case of manual employees there is a tendency for one of the three large unions operating in the public sector to have the dominant membership in any given area, of which there may be several in a large LEA. For non manual employees, membership was, in the main, limited to one public sector union.

While in our study collective and individual grievances were commonplace among school support staff, we found only a few instances where they had escalated to a withdrawal of labour; and most of these were of very short duration and focussed on the LEA rather than the school. These did not seriously impede the operation of the school.

Nevertheless, most Headteachers we interviewed indicated that they had had to intervene to resolve differences between groups of support staff; and some suggested there had been a growth in the number of incidents involving non teaching staff. These took many forms, including demarcation disputes between caretaking and canteen staff and refusal to work new equipment.

A significant number of Headteachers recounted the differences in union culture between support staff employees and teachers. This was chiefly manifest in the use of language such as 'brothers' and 'sisters' and shop stewards by the manual employees. Headteachers imbued with a strong sense of professionalism admitted to finding the culture of the 'shop floor' alien, and distanced themselves from problems which arose by the simple expedient of referring them directly to the LEA. A few Headteachers delegated responsibility for sorting out problems arising between members of support staff to the deputy head.

6.8 A Review of Some Main Issues

The current rise in union intervention in school affairs combined with the withdrawal of staff goodwill, were the two major concerns which most Headteachers shared in our study.

The Headteachers who appeared to cope most effectively with union sanctions and staff refusal to undertake extra curricula duties, seemed to be attitudinally attuned to the sources of staff grievances; conscious of the need to strengthen their relationships with representatives and staff generally; recognised the importance of contingency planning and the development of appropriate administrative systems; and as a matter of policy, developed and maintained a network of communications outside the school.

While we found many Headteachers who adopted some of these stratagems we found relatively few who, as a matter of deliberate policy, had embraced them in full. Consequently, many of the Headteachers became immersed in problems of their own making, or at least which might have been avoided if they had anticipated the implications of their actions.

In large part, the apparent reluctance of a significant number of the Headteachers in our sample to adopt a more pro-active and flexible leadership style seems to stem from a lack of understanding of employment relations coupled with a strong attachment to the past.

Our evidence suggests, therefore, that there is an urgent need for the majority of Headteachers who participated in this research to be exposed to staff management training. Here, they are currently at a disadvantage because many of the union representatives receive training in employment relations under the aegis of their unions.

7.0 MAINTENANCE OF STAFF DISCIPLINE

The research findings suggest that the Headteachers' approaches to the maintenance of staff discipline are not necessarily determined by LEA policies and procedures. There are a host of variables which influence the Headteachers' handling of disciplinary issues and those which appear particularly significant are briefly explored below.

7.1 LEA Context

In our study there is considerable variation in the way(s) in which LEAs approach breaches of discipline, and the extent to which they have developed and adapted the procedural agreements formulated at national level to meet their particular requirements.

While the procedure agreements conceived at the national level provide an adequate framework in which to operate, there appears to be a growing recognition among the LEAs in this study that rigid adherence to the national model can give rise to unfortunate consequences.

The use of a national prescribed disciplinary procedure has led, on occasions, to a disregard for local custom and practice both within the LEA and schools. Moreover, the subtle nuances of the alleged breaches of discipline have also, from time to time, been missed by those applying the procedures. The force of these observations is confirmed by a substantial body of case law.

Such difficulties may also be compounded by ambiguities in the Instruments and Articles of School Government where it is sometimes difficult to ascertain the role of the principal protagonists in the disciplinary processes. Thus we found instances where School Governors had been involved in the initial processes of adjudication and subsequently served on the appeals panel. This conflicts with the principles of natural justice and equity which underpin common law rights and use of disciplinary procedures.

The evidence also confirms that the procedural criteria and standards set by legislation and to some extent case law do not easily mesh with the process of professionally based peer group evaluation and individual and institutional development.

According to our research two of the LEAs concerned had adapted the national disciplinary procedures in line with their perceived needs. The remaining LEAs seemed set to follow though we are unable to confirm whether their declared intentions have been implemented in practice. Whatever the case, a significant number of Headteachers in our study seemed oblivious of staff disciplinary procedures.

7.2 The School

We found many instances where Headteachers had created problems for themselves (and in some cases the LEA) by what might be crudely described as inept handling of staff disciplinary matters.

The vast majority of the Headteachers in our sample admitted to a lack of knowledge about the legislation applying to discipline in the workplace. A significant number of the Headteachers also indicated that they were not very familiar with the LEA procedures though most knew of their existence.

The minority of the Headteachers who were knowledgeable about LEA staff disciplinary procedures either had direct experience as a protagonist or had studied them as part of their contingency planning.

The research findings highlight a number of issues which the Headteachers who got into difficulties indicated they had not previously considered. A relatively common mistake made by Headteachers was to assess a teacher's competence with reference to his/her colleagues rather than conducting an evaluation according to objective and known criteria.

We found other incidents where Headteachers had persevered with counselling a 'weak' teacher without keeping a record of what transpired, and as a consequence the Headteacher's position was undermined when disciplinary proceedings were subsequently invoked. Such incidents point to a particular difficulty confronting the Headteacher.

It is part of the traditional role of the Headteacher to counsel and offer professional advice to assistant teachers. While it is a relatively simple matter to keep records of counselling interventions, the central problem remains, which is: at what stage in the counselling process does the Headteacher decide it is appropriate to institute disciplinary proceedings against the teacher concerned? According to the Headteachers who had direct experience of such issues, the school Adviser had been unable to offer them much guidance or support.

With some notable exceptions, the Headteachers in our sample adopted a laissez faire approach to the maintenance of staff discipline. This is partly explained by the professional setting of the school, and partly by the Headteacher's lack of awareness of the implications arising from the adoption of inappropriate coping strategies.

Inconsistency in the application of the Code of Staff Conduct was relatively commonplace in the schools we visited. Apart from the school log most of the schools appeared to be devoid of systems for recording breaches of the Staff Code. Extreme violations of the Staff Code, e.g. gross misconduct, were in the main referred to the LEA and dealt with appropriately and expeditiously. But we found no evidence of written objective criteria for assessing teachers' competence or otherwise.

Nevertheless, most of the schools in our study had thus far avoided running into serious problems over the maintenance of staff discipline. However, a small minority of the Headteachers suggested that disciplinary procedures may be invoked more often in the light of teachers' decision to withdraw goodwill.

7.3 Non Teaching Staff

In our study we found cases where support staff had been dismissed chiefly on the grounds of misconduct, e.g. using the school premises for private gain. In these incidents the Headteachers concerned invariably conducted a preliminary investigation, alerted the Chairman of School Governors, and referred the matter to the LEA. While such cases were perceived to be an unwelcome intrusion on their time, most of the Headteachers concerned indicated that they did not seriously disrupt the running of the school.

The incident which the Headteachers found much more difficult to contend with were commonly about refusal to obey instructions. Caretaking staff particularly would typically refer the Headteacher to conflicting instructions received from the supervisor at Central or Area office, or claim they were conforming to union policies. The Headteachers were at a serious disadvantage where they had not taken the precaution to establish the position before issuing instructions.

We found many incidents which the Headteachers initially construed as breaches of discipline but on subsequent investigation recognised that whilst technically they were, the individuals concerned were, in the main, endeavouring to bring attention to their grievance(s). The Headteachers appeared to handle such incidents adroitly.

There was a tendency for supervisors within the school to follow tradition and 'march' individuals (who were alleged to be in breach of discipline) to the Headteacher's study. It was not uncommon in such incidents for the Headteacher to take action which effectively precluded further disciplinary action, even though it may have been warranted. This occurred particularly when they acted on the spur of the moment without conducting an investigation to ascertain the full facts. As a consequence the authority of the supervisor was placed in some doubt, and the LEA disciplinary procedures applying to support staff were undermined.

7.4 A review of Some Main Issues

The apparent trend for LEAs in our study to develop and implement staff disciplinary procedures appropriate to their particular circumstances is commendable, but their effectiveness is likely to be undermined in the absence of Headteachers addressing attention to their applicability. Moreover, there is an urgent need for Headteachers to review existing arrangements for handling staff disciplinary matters within the school.

This is not to suggest that professional informality should be abandoned as a way of conducting staff relationships. In many ways informal systems reflect mutual trust and respect among staff which is an essential aspect of the health and vitality of the school. However, the maintenance of informal arrangements and relationships can be endangered by a small minority of individuals who do not conform to the expected standards of behaviour and/or are

professionally incompetent. The threat that such individuals pose to the effective conduct of school affairs may be countered by the introduction of sensible and sensitive disciplinary procedures within the school. These must, of course, be consistent with LEA procedures.

With regard to support staff, the inherent problem is essentially the dual reporting system. In the Local Authority disciplinary procedures the first line supervisor is an integral part of the disciplinary process. Headteachers are not party to these procedures yet they have little option but to intervene if disruption to the life of the school is to be avoided.

8.0 INDIVIDUAL AND COLLECTIVE GRIEVANCES

8.1 Individual Grievances: The Headteacher's Role

The research findings suggest that individual grievances among staff in the schools we visited were many and varied, and according to the Headteachers, are growing in number.

A common experience among the Headteachers was that in many cases they could only deal with the symptoms rather than the root causes of individual grievances. This is to be expected since a significant number of the grievances were externally inspired, e.g. redeployment, and were largely beyond the Headteacher' sphere of influence and control.

Individual grievances which were rooted within the school, e.g. allocation of work, are taking up an increasing amount of the Headteachers' time and energies. Most school staff with a grievance displayed a marked tendency to by-pass heads of department and senior colleagues and take the issue direct to the Headteacher, or to their union representative in the school.

The majority of Headteachers in our study did not discourage individual members of staff from bringing their grievances direct to them, on the ground that it was their professional duty to endeavour to sort out the complaints and problems of assistant teachers. However, they were also concerned to restrict the involvement of the staff union representatives and more particularly external union officials in the grievance process. The Headteachers considered that granting 'open access' to individual members of staff reduced the possibility of union intervention.

8.2 Collective Grievances

In our Main Study, the incidence of collective grievances manifest in some form of collective action by school staff, was a fairly common phenomenon, although in most cases this stopped short of strikes.

A few schools in our sample had experienced token strike action by school meals staff between the time of our initial intervention and the start of our main investigation, but their duration was half a day or less and the impact on the school was minimal. These strikes do not feature in the research per se, because fundamental to our research design and philosophy was that at no time would we be perceived as intruding into or become drawn into ongoing activities.

The collective action taken by teaching staff in the schools we visited was invariably initiated by the national unions and was chiefly focussed upon cover for absent teachers and lunchtime supervision.

However, as part of the research strategy we monitored the news media generally, and the education press in particular, and concluded that the incidence of strikes by teaching staff was more widespread than our sample had initially indicated. Accordingly, we identified, and were granted access by an LEA which had experienced a protracted strike lasting some weeks which had been initiated by one of the national teachers' unions.

The study was restricted to 11 secondary schools most seriously affected by strike action. The interviews were conducted exclusively with the Headteachers concerned, though all the other parties in the dispute were informed of the research and the purpose of our study. The management of the school during a strike was thus considered solely from the standpoint of the Headteacher though in a few cases they invited deputy heads to attend the interviews.

8.3 Role of the Headteacher

It was indicated above that most schools in our Main Study had witnessed, or were currently experiencing, some form of collective action (apart from strikes) by school staff. The degree of disruption varied widely between schools ranging from minimal inconvenience to severe dislocation of their daily mode of operation. It should be stressed immediately that it was only a minority of schools which were seriously affected by, for example, the refusal of staff to cover for absent colleagues.

While additional support from the LEA was important in helping to reduce the impact of the teachers' action, the Headteachers' stance and attendant coping strategies were often crucial in protecting the school from considerable disruption.

Good organisational ability and administrative flair were seen to be vital by most Headteachers, but the research suggests that highly developed negotiating skills were a distinguishing feature of those Headteachers who coped with the action most effectively. We found many instances where the Headteacher had negotiated 'special' arrangements with individuals (including staff representatives) and groups of staff. In reaching a mutual accommodation these Headteachers stressed that it was important to preserve the integrity of the teachers involved or run the risk of a counter productive response which might have repercussions beyond the life of the present dispute.

Those Headteachers had also taken care to lay the necessary foundations before the advent of the dispute. Invariably, they had strong and effective senior management teams who enjoyed the respect of staff, and the Headteachers had gone to considerable lengths to establish good personal relationships with assistant teachers and, indeed, support staff.

In the study of the protracted teachers' strike the research findings suggest that this style or mode of operating is likely to be the most effective in reducing the full impact of action on the school.

A strike by a significant proportion of the teaching staff presents a considerable challenge to Headteachers and a large majority of those interviewed admitted that they found the experience emotionally, intellectually, and in some case physically demanding. This was in spite of, or perhaps because of having served their 'apprenticeship' in previous disputes within the LEA.

Nevertheless, most of the Headteachers had not prepared contingency plans beyond two or three days and were ill prepared to cope with the constant changes in the 'ground rules' prompted chiefly by the LEA, and the lack of communication between the parties involved. They gradually established routines and managed to keep the schools open in line with the policy of the LEA, though education provision was severely depleted, and pupils had to be sent home, often at short notice.

The personal attitudes of the Headteachers were strongly reflected in the coping strategies they adopted. The actions of some of the Headteachers were often inappropriate and were strongly influenced, if not dictated, by their personal conviction that teachers should never engage in strike action. As a consequence they were prone to exacerbate the already fraught situation.

The Headteachers who generally managed to avoid making ill advised decisions said that they endeavoured at all times to give themselves time to reflect on any actions they were proposing to take. They did not engage in a great deal of introspection about who was right, but what was right in the particular circumstances.

These Headteachers tended to take a longer term view than some of their peers who became immersed in the problems of the day. In looking to the future they formulated plans which greatly facilitated a quick return to normality when striking teachers came back into school. The Headteachers who, by their actions and general demeanour, alienated the teachers outside the school, and indeed some of those working normally, encountered difficulties in returning the school to effective operation.

8.4 A Review of Some Main Issues

The majority of Headteachers in this study handled individual grievances adroitly, but a large number of the complaints were of a trivial nature. Headteachers who operate a filtering system involving heads of department and senior staff in the grievance process are able to give more time and energy to perceived priorities, such as planning for the future.

The research suggests that Headteachers in general do not prepare themselves and their senior colleagues for the eventuality of a major dispute between school staff and employers. It is not simply a matter of devising contingency plans, though these are important, but involves building communication networks both within and outside the school, alerting senior colleagues to the need to become attitudinally aware of the possibility that people rarely conform to the prior expectations of others in a situation of overt conflict.

Headteachers who have not been involved in collective action of a serious nature, and in our study they were the majority, cannot conceive that it would ever happen in their school. Those who have, indicated that they too had made similar assumptions before the advent of major collective action by the staff in their schools.

9.0 TRAINING HEADS FOR STAFF MANAGEMENT: SOME RESIDUAL ISSUES

Headship is currently a demanding occupation, and at the present time the management of staff proves a particularly exacting aspect of the Headteacher's duties. By precept and example, by the acquisition of knowledge on staff management matters, through experience and skills acquired from workshop based training, the Headteacher, providing his/her attitudes are open and supportive enough, can acquire the necessary competence.

The Handbook of Staff Management and the allied and inter-related volume of training materials produced via this research project provides a basis upon which such training can take place.

Many of the staff management issues Headteachers encounter are likely to arise in highly contentious situations and for many new Headteachers will possibly be met for the first time. For example, almost without exception the management of non teaching staff exemplifies an area Headteachers have neither been trained nor prepared for and which poses considerable challenge to the professional expectations they brought to Headship. The skill to recognise that they are dealing with an employment relations situation calls for considerable insight and sophistication of response; correspondingly the penalty of inappropriate action may be severe. This may be in terms of personal esteem, but it is also likely to be in terms of future relationships within school and community, and also with officers and colleagues who have been called on to spend their time in untangling the problems and advising the Headteacher on more appropriate courses of action.

Staff management training will assist in developing Headteachers' knowledge and skills, but effective conduct of employment relations within the school is likely to be difficult to sustain in circumstances of confusion and uncertainty engendered by a lack of clarity between the respective roles and responsibilities of Headteachers and LEA personnel.

Trainers who have sufficient insight into the school cultures and who have extensive knowledge of employment relations matters (probably gained from other employment sectors) are few in number. The training of trainers represents, therefore, a substantial issue still to be resolved. The allied perception that the management of staff forms an integral and central part of the management function in schools, and, therefore, of management training for Headteachers, needs to be similarly recognised. Training in staff management must become an integral part of training programmes: an appendage of one or two one hour lectures to existing training programmes is insufficient to resolve the problems identified in the field by this research project.

10.0 SUMMARY OF MAIN RESEARCH FINDINGS

The objective of this research project was not to test hypotheses or to provide a nationally structured representative sample of opinion; rather it was to provide insight and illumination into those matters of staff management currently of concern to school, and, by inference, the LEA as well. In pursuing this objective the intention was to provide a realistic basis upon which training materials for the training of Headteachers (and other senior members of staff) could be produced. The principal outcome to this research is, therefore, a "Handbook of Staff Management", and an "Associated Volume of Inter-related Training Materials". The main findings of the research are implicitly (and in some instances explicitly) rehearsed there. Consequently this Report has sought brevity and conciseness.

It is obvious from published sources and accounts made to us by schools, officers of unions and LEA officers, that schools (and LEAs) are experiencing a considerable increase in the number, spate and complexity of staff management problems. The Headteacher is called on to deal with these matters, virtually on a daily basis, and has done so with a lack of the formal knowledge and the background of skills and experience which would be available to him/her as a manager in other employment sectors. Whilst this situation is rapidly being rectified, the public stance adopted on these issues by the education profession still appears to be that such matters are infrequent and provide the exception rather than the rule.

The rapidity with which the present circumstances have arisen initially exposed a lack of the necessary knowledge and skill on the part of individual LEA officer and Headteacher alike. On the part of the LEA, concerted and integrated policies for staff, as opposed to policies time bound and negotiated over specific issues, e.g. redeployment or redundancy, were also conspicuously absent. The LEA generally did not have and systematically apply manpower, staff appraisal, developmental and succession planning policies. The position as regards non teaching members of staff in schools is more occluded.

At the interface between school and LEA the research identified that there is a great deal of ambiguity in the system with respect to employment relations matters. This stems from two main sources. Firstly, that the powers and responsibilities of LEA officers and Headteachers tend to be obscured in practice. Secondly, that Headteachers in general displayed considerable ambivalence about retaining autonomy whilst diverting unpleasant tasks to the LEA, e.g. informing clerical staff that they were to be made redundant.

Whislt LEAs are currently addressing increasing attention to the development of procedures applying to employment relations, the general assumption among LEAs that Headteachers will be bound by such procedures is not sustainable from the research evidence. Headteachers were found who were often not aware of the existence of many procedures, or, when they were, viewed them as being largely irrelevant to the conduct of staff management in the school.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Headteachers consistently and unequivocally expressed the belief that their autonomy and authority are presently being eroded and nowhere is this more evident than in the example provided by staff recruitment.

The research findings suggest that Headteachers' involvement in the processes of recruitment of all categories of staff is becoming increasingly circumscribed by protectionist policies and local collective agreements (between employers and unions) to minimise the full repercussions of contraction, especially redeployment. In the case of support staff there is a tendency to exclude Headteachers from the processes of selection and appointment. This may be a reflection of both the establishment of support staff supervisors who are located outside the school, and of the existence of personnel policies adopted by personnel departments within the Local Authority, as opposed to the LEA.

The matter of training for Headship raises substantial issues, particularly taking note of those factors which this sample of Headteachers indicated increasingly absorbed their time and energy. According to these Headteachers, deputy headship, as it is presently construed, does not necessarily provide adequate preparation for Headship. So often in conception the role is too school bound and too circumscribed into traditional areas of pastoral or curriculum responsibility.

Staff development in the sphere of administrative and management development was not (with very few exceptions) widely practised in the schools visited in the Main Study. Staff assessment allied to succession policies and purposive individual and institutional development, and based upon institutional and individual diagnosed need, appears to be rare.

The research suggests that the majority of Headteachers in this study do not address sufficient attention to the purposes of staff communication and as a consequence frequently use inappropriate mechanisms and processes.

The evidence points to a rise in union intervention in school affairs. This coupled with the withdrawal of staff goodwill, was two of the major concerns shared by Headteachers in this study.

With some notable exceptions, the Headteachers adopted a laissez faire approach to the maintenance of staff discipline in the school. This is partly explained by the professional setting of the school, and partly by the Headteachers' lack of awareness of the implications arising from the adoption of inappropriate coping strategies.

The majority of Headteachers in this study handled individual grievances adroitly but devote excessive time and energy to dealing with complaints of a trivial nature.

In situations which appear to have a basis for comparison, differences in the effectiveness with which any two Headteachers may handle the staff management issues confronting them may emerge. Differences in performance, excluding chance factors, are explicable in part in terms of the coping strategies adopted. These would involve: anticipatory strategies; a high level of inter-personal and negotiating skill; and knowledge requisite to the situation. The coping Headteacher would be aware of an overall frame of reference in which action is located, to have developed information networks, and to be politically selective in seeking influence. Inevitably such action erodes traditionally and hierarchically conceived lines of responsibility.

It is on such matters as these that the need for staff management thinking to become central to the day to day management of the school, and to pervade the strategic development of LEA policies and procedures emerged as a crucial issue. Such thinking should equally form an integral and central part of course construction and Headteacher training. The absence of such is generally conspicuous, and it is in these matters that the knowledge and skills possessed by, and the role and functions of the team of LEA Advisers/Inspectors, occupying as they do the interface between school and LEA, become particularly exposed.

For many years the principal regulatory mechanism for staff management has been largely effected by reference to shared professional norms. Circumstances in the last few years have identified areas of considerable ambiguity, as well as identifying the extent to which labour law had made an impact on these perceptions. Once it is appreciated that the codification and clarification of such issues does not in fact destroy professional relationships in the school but in fact strengthens them, then considerable progress can be made towards resolving at least some of the problems which this research project has identified as presently existing in schools.

11.0 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH ARISING FROM THIS RESEARCH PROJECT

This project has served to bring sharply into focus two major issues where additional research would be beneficial to the service.

Firstly, during the course of this research we have come into contact with very many primary Headteachers, and from their reaction to our work in the secondary schools, there are strong reasons for believing that the study could be profitably replicated in the primary education sector.

To be credible and acceptable to primary Headteachers, employment relations training materials need to be empirically based. While some of the materials produced from this project could be used for training primary Headteachers in the sphere of staff management, in the main they are too closely identified with secondary schools to be acceptable in the primary sector.

From the experience and insights gained from this project, research into the staff management training need of primary Headteachers could be undertaken in a shorter time span with the attendant implications for research funding.

Secondly, the research findings confirm that in our sample, the processes of succession planning and performance assessment or appraisal for school staff, are alien to tradition and, therefore, are rarely pursued systematically in schools. Where attempts were being made to implement such processes we found little evidence to suggest the existence of a clearly articulated management philosophy which demonstrated the needs of the school and individuals concerned.

While there has been a great deal of discussion within the service about the most appropriate criteria to be used for assessing teachers' competence in the classroom, sufficient attention does not appear to have been addressed to the processes of MANAGING appraisal systems within schools.

The proposals for a new teachers' career structure (currently the subject of discussion between employers and teachers' associations) include the provision for staff appraisal. Our research suggests that the implementation of staff appraisal in schools will require careful monitoring in the early years of operation in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the way(s) assessment is conducted.

It is important that a research project is mounted shortly, in advance of the formal introduction of staff appraisal into schools. To delay would run the risk of confirming inappropriate management practice and undermine any recommendations that may be made from the research. Equally, such research requires not simply knowledge and experience about how schools are run, but considerable knowledge about staff appraisal systems per se, and their management in particular.

APPENDIX 1

CHARACTERISTICS OF LEAS IN THE MAIN STUDY

Local Govt. Type	County Council	Metropolitan Authority	London Borough
No. of LEAs	3	2	1

Geographical Region	South East	Midlands	North	West and Wales
No. of LEAs	3	1	1	1

Population Density	Urban/ Rural	Urban/ Rural/ Industrial	Connurbation
No. of LEAs	1	2	3

Administrative Pattern	Administered Centrally	Administered through Area Offices
No. of LEAs	3	3

APPENDIX 2

CLASSIFICATION OF SCHOOLS ACCORDING TO ORGANISATIONAL CRITERIA FOR SELECTION

The aim in constructing our sample has been to seek representativeness by type rather than to aim for any national representativeness by sample.

When we met LEA officers, the following organisational criteria were suggested as guidelines for the selection of schools:

- Size according to the number of pupils (Table 1)
- Voluntary Aided and State Schools (Table 2)
- Schools according selection (Table 3)
- 11-18 and Junior and Middle Schools (Table 4)
- Single and Split Site Schools (Table 5)
- Schools formed through Amalgamation (Table 6)
- Ex-grammar, ex-secondary modern and purpose built comprehensive schools (Table 7)

The tables overleaf indicate the extent to which these criteria have been met.

TABLE 1 : DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS ACCORDING TO NUMBER OF PUPILS

No. of pupils	No. of schools
500 or less	1
501 - 700	8
701 - 900	7
901 - 1300	14
1301 - 1500	4
1501 - 2000	4
2001 -	2
TOTAL	40

TABLE 2 : NUMBER OF VOLUNTARY AIDED AND STATE SCHOOLS

Type of school	No. of schools
Vol. aided	6
State	34
TOTAL	40

TABLE 3 : NUMBER OF SCHOOLS ACCORDING TO PREVIOUS SELECTIVE PATTERN

Type of school	No. of schools
Comprehensive	38
Grammar	1
Secondary Bilateral	1
TOTAL	40

TABLE 4 : NUMBER OF SCHOOLS ACCORDING TO PUPIL AGE RANGE

Type of School	No. of schools
11 - 18	31
11 - 16	5
13 - 18	3
14 - 18	1
TOTAL	40

TABLE 5 : NUMBER OF SINGLE AND SPLIT SITE SCHOOLS

Type of school	No. of schools
Single site	27
Two sites	8
More than two sites	5
TOTAL	40

TABLE 6 : NUMBER OF SCHOOLS FORMED THROUGH AMALGAMATION

Type of school	No. of schools
Fully amalgamated	13
Amalgamated 6th form only	1
Original schools	26
TOTAL	40

TABLE 7 : CLASSIFICATON OF SCHOOL ACCORDING TO ORIGINAL EDUCATIONAL STATUS

Type of school	No. of schools
Grammar	24
Secondary modern	18
Purpose built and comprehensive	9
Boys' Technical	4
Girls' Technical	1
TOTAL	56*

* Total exceeds sample size because it includes merged schools

APPENDIX 3 A

STAFF AND EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS IN SCHOOLS

TRAINING OF HEAD TEACHERS PROJECT

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR HEAD TEACHERS

1. **Change and its implications for the role and duties performed by the Head Teacher**

1.1 In the last decade or so it has been argued that the nature and function of the school has changed significantly. What do you think the major changes are, and how have they affected the responsibilities and activities performed by Head Teachers? e.g.

Falling pupil rolls
Maintenance or development of the curriculum
Organisational changes
Pupil welfare and pastoral care
Changes in the law
General Managerial and Administrative work
Manpower planning, staff development & training, (including staff morale)
Employee relations with teaching and non-teaching staff and their unions
Management of resources

1.2 Have employee relations and staff development matters increased in importance during this period?

If 'yes':

1. What importance do you give to staff management development and employee relations in the school?

2. How much of your time is spent on these matters?

3. What training have you had on staff management and development?

2. Development and Change in the Organisation of the School
(see School Handbook for staff)

2.1 What were the major changes that have taken place in the development of the school in the last decade?

Checklist: Organisational Change
Grammar/Secondary Modern to Comprehensive
Single sex to co-educational
Independent to maintained
Single to split site
Growth and contraction (Number of pupils)
Catchment area
Parental choice (1980 Education Act)
Amalgamation Schools (see 2.3)

2.2

Checklist: Issues related to the amalgamation of schools
Uncertainty, rumour and staff morale
Mechanisms created for advanced planning
Rationalisation of the Governing Bodies
Consultations with teachers, teacher representatives and trade unions
Development of a Unified Staff Structure
Creation of new posts (open and closed competitions)
Rationalisation of the Staff Structure
Consultations & negotiations relating to new staff structure
Protection of terms and conditions for those that fail to secure posts of same status (Head Teachers, Deputy Heads, Departmental Heads, etc.)
Dominant school and the underdog syndrome
Congruity and incongruity in matching two different organisational structures (e.g. year vs. house system)
Communication between sites (telephones, transport)
Commuting and peripatetic teachers
Renegotiation of long standing agreements
Conflicts and changes in custom and practice
Other

2.3 Negotiation for and allocation of Burnham Points in relation to establishment and the allocation of Scale Teaching Posts

Teaching Posts: What are the number of pupil and teacher points and in which Burnham group is the school?

Number of pupil points
Number of teacher points
Burnham Group
Complement in relation to establishment (teacher posts)
Teacher/pupil ratio

2.4 Have there been any significant changes in the points allocated and the group in which the school is categorised in the last five years?

2.5 What are the principal factors that influence you in the allocation of teacher points in the distribution of scale posts?

2.5.1 Has the method or criteria by which you relate the allocation of teacher points to the distribution of scale posts changed in the last five years?

2.6 Within the school, with whom would you consult on the allocation of points in relation to the distribution of scale posts?

2.7 Would you regard this as suitable matter to discuss or consult with school teacher representatives?

3. The Teacher's Day

In the last few years the teachers' associations have raised the issue of the Teacher's Day - arguing, amongst other things, that teachers' pay settlements have failed to take many non-contractual professional duties and responsibilities into account.

3.1 Has any member of staff, or staff representative, raised a question with you that might be linked to the issue of the teacher's day?

3.2 When this issue was raised was it linked to any threat of individual or collective action by the staff in your school?

3.3 What do you think was the reason for bringing up that issue at that time?

3.4 What action did you take?

3.5 Do you think that this issue (see check list) is likely to be raised (again) in the future?

3.6 CHECKLIST: GRIEVANCES AND ACTION RELATED TO THE TEACHERS' DAY ISSUE

Issues	*Raised by whom & when*	*Threat of Action (what & by whom)*	*Action taken by individual or staff*	*Action taken by the Head-teacher*	*Reason for issue being raised and action taken*
Supervision of school meals					
Escorting children off the premises (10 minute rule)					
Attendance at parent evenings or other functions after school					
Withdrawal from extra-curricular activities					
Refusal to cover for staff absences					
Contact Hours					
Preparation time					
Homework marking					
Teachers' Diary					
Other					

4. Discipline and Dismissal and the Use of Procedure

4.1 How do you deal with disciplinary matters concerning teaching staff, in particular what are the sorts of circumstances in which you would consider invoking 'formal' procedure?

4.2 What sorts of issue or behaviour do you consider would merit considering some sort of disciplinary action?

4.3 Are there any recent examples where you considered taking disciplinary action?

If 'yes':

1. What action did you take?

4.4 Have there been any cases recently where you have used, or considered using, the formal machinery? If 'yes', give example.

4.5 In considering a disciplinary issue, would you consult and how would you go about consulting the Education Officer, the Advisers/ Inspectors and the Board of Governors?

4.6 Would you consult with any other professional association?

4.7 When considering disciplinary issues, do you, and can you always make, the distinction between issues concerning "conduct" and issues related to "competence"?

If 'yes':

1. Are there different procedures for dealing with matters of conduct and competence, or do you handle them in different ways?

4.8 How far and in what way do external bodies like the LEA, the Advisers/Inspectors, or the Board of Governors constrain you in taking "effective" disciplinary action?

4.9 Have there been any changes recently in how these external bodies influence how you deal with disciplinary matters? e.g.

4.10 How do you deal with disciplinary matters concerning non-teaching staff?

Caretakers
Cleaners
School meals staff
Technical staff
Administrative & Secretarial Staff

See question 1-9 above

5. Union membership, representation and facilities in the school

5.1 Which of the teaching representative organisations have members in the school?

5.2 Which, if any, of the staff associations have elected representatives?

5.3 Do any of the representatives have direct access to you on trade union or collective staff issues?

5.4 Have two or more of the elected representatives ever made a joint representation to you on any issue?

If yes,

1. What was the issue and what were the circumstances under which they made a joint approach?

2. What was your reaction?

5.5 Is there a joint union committee (forum) in the school?

5.6 How do you communicate your policies to your staff in the school?

5.7 Do you have regular meetings with elected staff representatives?

If yes:

1. How often?

2. Do they involve all elected staff representatives or just some?

5.8 Do you provide or allow staff representatives any of the following facilities? (see check list Q7.)

5.9 Has the question of facilities every been raised by any of the elected school representatives?

5.10 Do you regularly or on an occasional basis provide elected staff association and trade union representatives with information related to the management of the school? (See check list 8)

1. Is this information given in confidence or do you provide it to all staff?

5.11 What information would you not be willing to disclose to teacher representatives?

5.12 Has any teacher association or trade union representative asked you for information concerning the management or administration of the school? If yes,

1. Which representative?
2. What information did they request?
3. For what reason did they want the information?
4. What action did you take?

CHECKLIST: UNION MEMBERSHIP, REPRESENTATION AND FACILITIES

Membership. representation and facilities		NUT	NAS/UWT	AMMA	Other
1.	Membership: nos. or percentage				
2.	Elected representative				
3.	Representation - access to Head Teacher on union and staff matters				
4.	Joint representation - two or more representatives jointly approaching Head Teacher				Issues
5.	Joint Union Committee				
6.	Regular meeting with HT				
7.	i. Notice board				
	ii. Use of telephone				
	iii. Filing cabinet				
	iv. Use of office				
	v. Meetings on school premises				
	vi. Elections on school premises				
8.	i. List of new appointments to the school				
	ii. Information concerning vacancies in the school				
	iii. Annual list of teachers employed (by scale).				
	iv. List of capital expenditure				
	v. Burnham points & scale				
	vi. Distribution of Scale Points & posts				
	vii. Staffing & establishment				
	viii Capitation				
9.	Staff turnover Other				

6. Recruitment and Selection

6.1 Would you describe your policy and the procedure you use for the recruitment, selection and appointment of teaching staff.

Probationary Teacher
Other scale 1 posts
Scale 2 posts
Scale 3 posts
Scale 4 posts
Senior Teacher posts Deputy Head

6.2 Would you describe your policy and, where appropriate, your involvement and the procedure you use for the appointment of non-teaching staff.

Caretakers
Cleaning staff
School meals staff
Administrative & Secretarial Staff
Technicians

6.3 Within the school, with whom do you consult on the recruitment and appointment of:

1. teaching staff?
2. non-teaching staff?

6.4 Whom else do you have to consult or inform about the appointment of:

1. teaching

2. non-teaching staff?

6.5 Do you consider the appointment of staff a matter suitable to discuss with elected teacher representatives before you make an appointment?

6.6 Do you inform elected teacher representatives specifically about new teaching appointments after they have been made?

6.7 How do you inform the staff generally of new appointments?

6.8 Have any of the elected teacher representatives ever raised with you the question of appointment as an issue? If yes:

1. For what reason?

7. Promotion, Staff Development and Training

7.1 What is your policy on promotion?

7.2 What are the major constraints on putting your present policy into effect? And:

1. What opportunities do you see on the horizon for developing your promotion policy?

7.3 How do you communicate your promotion policy to staff generally and to individual teachers?

7.4 How do you think the present situation is going to effect teachers' careers and morale in the future?

7.5 What is your approach and policies on staff development and training?

Checklist: Staff Development and Training
Probationary teacher
Assistant teachers
Departmental Heads
Pastoral staff
Senior teacher & Deputy Head posts
Head teacher

8. Allocation and Deployment of Staff in the School

8.1 Who is responsible for the time table?

8.2 Is the development and operation of the timetable a source of grievance to teachers?

1. In what way?

8.3 Has the timetable in relation to the allocation and deployment of teaching staff ever been raised as an issue by the teacher representatives in school? If yes:

1. What action did you take?

8.4 Do you think this is a matter that is relevant and should be discussed with teacher representatives in schools?

8.5 Do you or members of your senior staff discuss or consult teacher representatives specifically on the scheduling of the timetable?

8.6 Have teacher representatives ever raised any other issues related to the allocation and deployment of staff?

8.7 Do you discuss or consult teacher representatives about changes in the working of the school day?

8.8 Is cover for sickness or staff absence a source of grievance for any teachers in the school?

8.9 Has cover for absence ever been raised as an issue by teacher representatives in the school?

8.10 Has any teacher ever refused to cover for an absent member of staff?

8.11 Have you developed any policy or working practices in school for cover in cases of absence?

8.12 Have the maternity leave provisions caused you any concern or problems?

1. Would it present you with difficulties in relation to Heads of Department, Senior Teacher or Specialist posts?

8.13 Would a paternity leave provision greatly exacerbate the problem?

8.14 Are there any difficulties in the allocation of responsibilities between pastoral and academic staff?

8.15 Have you been involved in any issue or are you aware of any problem related to the deployment of non-teaching staff?

1. Have there been any cases of refusal to carry out duties, or

2. disputes about who does what?

8.16 Have there been any issues related to the demarcation of duties and responsibilities?

Checklist: Demarcation Disputes
Technical and teaching staff
Administrative and teaching staff
Caretakers and cleaners
Caretakers and Technicians and Teachers
School Meals Service and Cleaners
School Meals Supervisors and Teachers and Kitchen Staff
Other

9. Health and Safety

In the last few years, as a result of the Health and Safety at Work Act, there have been a number of changes in the duties and responsibilities of employers and employees.

10.1 Have, and how have, these changes affected your duties and responsibilities and those of teaching and non-teaching staff?

10.2 Have health and safety matters ever been raised as an issue by either teaching or non-teaching staff representatives?

10.3 How were the issues dealt with and resolved?

Checklist: Health and Safety
LEA Code of Practice or Guidance on Health & Safety
Safety representative in school
Safety committee in school
Recording of accidents and near-miss accidents
Improvement notes, prohibition notices
Procedures for rectification
School safety officer
Safety inspection procedures
Time-off for inspectors (cover for other duties)
Facilities for Safety Representative & Safety Officer
Access to information
Fire drill and precautions
Consultation on building design and other environmental and hygiene factors

10. **Falling Rolls and School Closures**
Redeployment, premature retirement and redundancies

We are in a situation of falling rolls. In some instances in some LEA's this may lead to the amalgamation of schools and even school closures.

10.1 How is this affecting staff morale and relationships in school?

10.2 Have you been in a position where you have lost staff to or been forced to take staff from other schools (redeployment)? If 'yes':

1. How has this affected your staff management policy and relations in the school?

10.3 Has the possibility/question of premature retirement been raised with you by any individual member of staff or staff representative/

If yes:

1. In considering the question, what was your reaction in relation to the overall performance of the school (e.g. wanted to refuse an individual request because you would lose a good teacher or create an inbalance in the curriculum, etc.)

10.4 In a redundancy situation where you might be considering either volunteers for early retirement or redundancy or having to develop an enforced redundancy policy, what would be the main criteria or factors you would take into account when considering applications on making staff redundant?

1. Is this a question you have discussed with staff generally, senior teachers or elected staff representatives?

2. What advice does your union give you on this issue?

Checklist: Redeployment and Redundancy
Volunteers for premature retirement and redundancy
Rejection of volunteers
Consultations
Replacement of staff teaching in key curriculum areas
Redundancy notification
Reasons for redundancy given in writing
Criteria/basis for selection
Disclosure to school representatives
Method of selection
Method of effecting redundancy & the period over which they take place
No discrimination clause with regard to the period of service

11. Individual and Collective Action

11.1 In the last five years, have there been any instances of individual or collective industrial action by teaching or non-teaching staff? (See check list)

11.2 Were the reasons for industrial action internal or external to the school?

11.3 What action did you take?

11.4 Has there been any increase of individual or collective action by non-teaching staff?

Checklist: Individual & Collective Action
Refusal to do extra-curricular activities
Refusal to teach other subjects
Refusal to see pupils off the premises
Ban on school meals supervision
Refusal to collect dinner money
Work to rule/contract
Strike
Refusal to cover for absent staff
Other

12. External Constraints and Resources

In this section we want to consider the external agencies (the Board of Governors, the Education and other LEA Officers, HMI, the Professional Associations, Trade Union Officers, etc. and other informal links) and how they constrain or support the head teacher.

12.1 To whom to you go first for advice on questions of staff management or employee relations?

12.2 How often do you meet formally with the (Board of Governors)?

1. How often do they visit the school?

12.3 Is it possible for you to informally contact the (Chairman/ Board of Governors)?

12.4 In what circumstances, or upon what issue, would you consult with (a member of the Board of Governors)?

Is it possible, and in what circumstances, would you convene an extraordinary meeting with the Board of Governors?

Does the Board of Governors regularly visit the school?

In what circumstances would the Board of Governors make a special visit to the school?

12.5 LEA Education Officers (as 12.2 to 4)

12.6 LEA Advisers/Inspectors (as 12.2 to 4)

12.7 HMI (as 12.2 to 4)

12.8 Have any full-time or external teacher representatives visited the school in an official or unofficial capacity?

1. For what reason?

2. Was it as a result of procedure? If yes,

3. How was the issue preogressed or resolved?

13. School and Teacher Evaluation and Staff Management

13.1 To what extent do you think school and teacher evaluation are likely to become issues over the next 5 years and what are the implications for staff management and training?

13.2 Has the question of school and teacher evaluation been raised by any individual member of staff or teacher representative?

If 'yes':

1. What action did you take?

Checklist: School and Teacher Evaluation
Problems and methods of evaluating the school
" " " the internal organisation
" " " the performance of teachers
The role of consultation in developing methods of evaluation
Evaluation as a means of identifying changes, e.g. in curriculum, methods of teaching, etc.
Internal v. external evaluation
Disclosure of evaluation findings and report
Agreeing terms of reference and selection of criteria
Provision of resources to implement recommendations
Other

15.1 What recommendations would you make for improving the conduct of staff management in schools?

15.2 If you were running a staff management training programme for Head Teachers, what would be the essential ingredients of the syllabus?

15.3 To what extent do you think that Deputy Headship (or other senior posts in the school) provide a necessary and sufficient training for headship?

APPENDIX 3 B

RESEARCH INTO CURRENT PROBLEMS IN STAFF MANAGEMENT/EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS AND CONSEQUENT TRAINING NEEDS OF HEADTEACHERS IN THE MAINTAINED SECONDARY SECTOR

The Management of Employment Disputes

HEADTEACHER'S INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Outline of areas for investigation

Statement: In this discussion we want to focus on the position of the Headteacher when a dispute occurs which disrupts, or is potentially disruptive, to the school. We are not concerned with the postures of principal protagonists at national or LEA level but on the impact of the dispute on this school.

PART A

Characteristics of the Situation

1. Headteacher characteristics
   - 1.1 time in post
   - 1.2 previous experience as Headteacher, experience of other LEAs
   - 1.3 trade union membership

2. Character of school
   - 2.1 Burnham Group, point allocation and LEA allocations policy (i.e. bottom, middle, or top of Burnham range)
   - 2.2 Teaching establishment and complement and the distribution of scale points according to designated positions
   - 2.3 Number of pupils and whether the school is in an expanding or contracting situation and whether it has been or will be reorganised
   - 2.4 Character of milieu and social class intake
   - 2.5 Non teaching staff

3. Character of the Staff and Domestic Trade Union Organisation

3.1 Trade Union membership:

NUT

NAS/UWT

AMMA

PAT

NALGO

T & GWU

OTHER

NON MEMBERS

3.2 Which is the dominant or most union presence in the school?

3.3 Non teaching staff

PART B

Headteacher recognition of school representatives, academic and non teaching

4. The Domestic Organisation

4.1 Are there elected school representatives?

4.2 Are they elected annually?

4.3 Where does the AGM take place?

4.4 Are there regular meetings of the individual unions? Are they held on school premises? Are they held during the school day? (lunchtime) or outside school hours? What is the level of attendance?

4.5 Are there regular or ad hoc joint meetings involving two or more of the unions/professional associations? If ad hoc, on what sort of issues?

4.6 Does the Headteacher have regular or ad hoc meetings with the representatives of the individual associations? If ad hoc, on what sort of issues and for what purposes?

4.7 Does the Headteacher have regular or ad hoc joint meetings involving two or more elected representatives of the teacher unions/associations? If ad hoc, for what sort of issue or for what purposes?

4.8 Are there members of the staff who hold elected positions in the union organisation above the level of the school? If yes, at what levels? How does his/her presence in the school effect the character of the school trade union organisation? Does his/her attendance at meetings effect the running of the school in any way? (Arrangements for cover, etc.)

4.9 What facilities are provided for school trade unions/ association representatives?

time-off for trade union duties
noticeboard in Common Room
filing cabinet
access to telephone for union member
private room for individual consultation
room for meetings
time for meetings

4.10 In general terms, how would you describe the attitude of the staff, or of different sections of the staff, to trade union membership and the principles of trade unionism, in particular - taking collective action? Where there are differences among the staff, are these reflected in membership of particular associations?

PART C

Collective Disputes

5. The Dispute

5.1 How did you come to know that a dispute was potentially imminent?

5.1 (cont.)

Council

Trade Union

LEA

Board of Governors

5.2 When, and how, did the staff generally come to know about the 'imminency' of the dispute and, how would you describe their initial reaction? Were the reactions different in different groups of staff?

The unions concerned and other associations

Deputy Head and Senior Teacher

Younger and Older Teachers

Trade Union Activist/Non

Other

5.3 On the 12th February it was reported in the Press that the union called a three day strike and threatened to call an indefinite strike from 25th February. Through what channels were you informed?

LEA	When	How
TU	When	How
Board of Governors	When	How
Others	When	How

5.4 When were you officially informed that there was to be an indefinite strike?

LEA	When	How
TU	When	How
Board of Governors	When	How
Other	When	How

5.5 What was you initial reaction?

5.6 What plans and actions did you take to ameliorate the consequences of the collective action?

Meeting of Management Team to Plan Strategy

5.6 (cont.)

Meetings with TU Reps. (bilateral and multilateral)

Meeting with Staff

Contact with Parents

Liaison with LEA

Board of Governors

Other

5.7 What immediate effects did the initial three day action have on the organisation and running of the school?

5.8 What was the reaction of the different groups and sections among the staff?

5.9 Did all the members of the union concerned follow the union's instructions? What was the reaction of the members of the other associations including non teaching staff?

5.10 What secondary collective action was taken by the union concerned and members of the other associations and non teaching staff?

Picketing
Refusal to cover for staff engaged in collective action
Refusal to cross picket lines
No cover for other absent staff
Work to Contract
Other

5.11 The SECOND STAGE of the dispute was when a major union called for an indefinite strike. Did this instruction materially effect the organisation and running of the school? Did it change the attitudes of the various groups and sections among the teaching and non teaching staff? How?

5.12 Did the SECOND STAGE of the dispute lead to an escalation of secondary action by the union and the members of the other associations and non teaching staff?

5.12 (cont.)

Picketing
Refusal to cover for staff involved
Refusal to cross picket lines
No cover for absent staff
Work to contract
Other

5.13 The THIRD STAGE of the dispute and escalation of the dispute was when a picket line was set up to stop deliveries to schools. Did this materially effect the organisation and running of the school? Did it change the attitudes of the various sections of the teaching and non teaching staff?

5.14 Did the THIRD STAGE of the dispute lead to an escalation of secondary action by the union and the members of the other associations and non teaching staff?

5.15 During the period of the dispute, what instructions and advice did you receive or request from the LEA and/or your Association?

5.16 Were you involved in consultations or discussions with other Headteachers about the dispute and its affect on the school? What were they about?

5.17 During the dispute what arrangements were made for consultation, communication and discussion of the dispute and its effects with

(a) the union representatives and members?
(b) the members of other associations, and
(c) the staff as a whole?

Were these 'arrangements' substantially different from the normal provisions for consultation in the school? What are they?

5.18 What was the pupils' response to the dispute?

5.19 Following the resolution of the dispute, what were the initial reactions of the various groups and sections of the staff and pupils?

5.19 (cont.)

Management Team
Staff engaged in collective action
Members of other associations
Non teaching staff
Younger staff/older staff
Pupils
Others

5.20 Has the dispute led to a significant change of attitude among the various groups and sections of staff and pupils?

5.21 Did the dispute lead to changes in trade union affiliation?

Resignation
Transfer of membership
Membership by previously non union members
Other

5.22 Do you think the dispute has in any way affected the willingness of the staff or sections of it, to engage in future nationally or locally instituted collective action?

5.23 Has the dispute in any way stimulated staff participation in the activities of their trade unions and associations at school or other levels?

5.24 To what extent, and how, has the dispute changed the relationship between yourself and

(a) association representatives in the school?
(b) the staff, or sections of the staff, generally?
(c) your more senior colleagues?

5.25 Looking back, to what extent would you say that at the level of the school it was a '<u>controlled dispute</u>' to the extent that it minimised the trauma caused to the school?

5.26 Has the dispute resulted in any lasting divisions or animosity among the staff or between different sections of the staff?

5.27 With the benefit of hindsight, would you have taken different decisions/actions during the dispute?

6. Other Collective Disputes

6.1 Prior to the redundancy dispute, what experience had you had of collective action? How did it affect the organisation and running of the school and the attitudes of staff?

Meal Supervision	When	What
Refusal to supply cover		
Refusal to participate in extra curricula work		
Refusal to attend meetings		
Picketing		
Caretakers' dispute		

7. Residual Questions

7.1 Are there any other aspects we have omitted, related to the position of the Headteacher in a collective dispute situation?

7.2 Are there any significant developments in the organisation and working of the school that have arisen as a result of the dispute?

7.3 Have there been any developments in the management and organisation of the school that have been brought to a head sooner because of the dispute?

7.4 What sort of advice would you give to a Headteacher who was about to experience collective action for the first time? What are the critical decisions and judgements?

7.5 Reflecting on your experience of managing a school in a collective dispute situation, what preparation (and support), if any, would have better prepared you for the experience?